



Ifw

August 13, 2006

Enclosures:

1. "Preferred Species" (1 page)
2. "Selected Claims" (2 pages)
3. Synopsis of Patent Application (9 pages)
4. The "Family" (graphic rep. -- 1 page)

Robert J. Canfield, Examiner
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Glenn R. Rouse
P.O. Box 2122
Traverse City, Mi. 49685
Email: au149@tcnet.org
Ph: 231-313-0051

(re: Pat. Ap. 10/623,787)

Dear Mr. Canfield,

I'm the inventor of the "Radial-hinge Mechanism" and for the record with regard to this invention: I know more about this invention than anyone, and more about its *Patent Application* and its Claims. My original attorney, Michael Long, and I, carefully composed the disclosure and my insistence on thoroughness resulted its multi-leveled *Application*, but really just to cover its basics. I'm sorry if it seems excessive.

But now Attorney Long has moved on to another firm and *Price, Heneveld, et al*, has turned my case over to Attorney Brian Cheslek -- a new "unknown" in this process as far as I'm concerned. A very young fellow, maybe a rookie.

Anyhow, Mr. Canfield, I expressed some reservations about his response to your July 12th "Office Communication". But I also gave him my full confidence, and that I would trust his judgment (and the Partner he was working under). This will be his first submission of paperwork on my behalf since he was assigned to me last Oct.

My key reservation about his response was its shortcoming in providing you with "preferred species" such as you requested. I now enclose a review of those items, though also keeping in mind that *Mechanism 400* is a 12-spoke *Radial-hinge Mechanism*, chosen as the key performer in the Application, but mainly to make the task of rendering this unique geometric device on CAD (Ref. also to paragraph 0126 in Pat.Ap.). In Figs. 17-26, I spotlight a 16-spoke mechanism for construction purposes, though also divulging the unique formula of construction that makes all versions of this mechanism members of the same family, i.e. same species. Thus, *Mechanism 400* (starting in Fig. 4) is "preferred" only by virtue of its abundance in the Figures for illustrative purposes. And I include its designation in the enclosed set of Claims only as a reference to orient the claims with the Figures and help to define what's generic.

As to the whole set of Claims 1-61...
They were originally designed upon the criteria of presenting three independent claims to cover the multitude of embodiments this geometrical device can pose as...

Claim # 1: from the premise of identifying the family of mechanisms construed from a set of spokes of equal length.

continued...

Claim # 31: from the premise of identifying the family of mechanisms construed from elongate members with no mention of their lengths being equal (until later in dependent claim # 37).

Claim #61: with the intent to exclusively protect a 16-spoke version of Radial-hinge Mechanism and all its niceties, although a single significant error in this Claim # 61 identifies the mechanism as having "five arcs per chord" and that should read as "seven arcs per chord" -- and thereby reading on that second most prevalent version of the mechanism in the Figures -- the subsequent Mechanism 2600, developed throughout Figs. 17-26 and seen in a truncated version in Fig. 16. I'm sorry you were not informed of this error; and I didn't press for the change because, after all, there is as well a 16-spoke mechanism at five arcs per chord in Fig. 15.

To give you a better handle on the *Application*, I also enclose a "synopsis" of that treatise. I highlight references to the invention's unique character of being a "family" of mechanisms. In addition, I throw in a graphic, illustrating a portion of the "family".

Unbeknownst to my attorney, I have dispatched this letter to your office. I am sorry if this represents some sort of interference or impropriety. I also do not expect a reply from you unless you wish to acknowledge receipt of this packet. All in all, the intent here is to give you a better understanding of the item at hand... nothing more.

Cordially,



P.S. -- the enclosed subset of Claims comes by way of parlance with my attorney to isolate and diminish the scope of the claims to relate to "preferred species" but not to forfeit the validity of the remaining claims.

In addition, I have small prototypes available for scrutiny if ever you want to observe and handle one or another version of this thing called a *Radial-hinge Mechanism*.



August 13, 2006 Sun.

To meet with requirement (request?)
posted in Examiner R. Canfield's
"Office Communication" of July 12, 2006:

Glenn Rouse
P.O. Box 2122
Traverse City, Mi. 49685
au149@tcnet.org
Cell# 231-313-0051

**Listing of "Preferred Species" over all those
shown in the Patent Application 10/623,787 pending...**

| <u>Mechanism or Component:</u> | <u># designation:</u> | <u>within Figs:</u> |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| *Radial-hinge mechanism | 400 | starting in Figs. 4a-f... |
| spoke | 402 | starting in Figs. 4a-f, 7... |
| spoke-end connector | 404 | starting in Figs. 4a-f, 7, 8... |
| spoke-body double-clip connector. . | 900 | 9, 10, 11a-b |
| constraining band | 2902 | 29, 47 (formerly 4702) |
| double-capped inter-hinge connector | 4504 | starting in Figs. 45-47, 50... |

* and including comments made in cover letter
about the "family" of Radial-hinge Mechanisms...